arXiv:1607.01228v1 [math.AC] 5 Jul 2016

A CANONICAL POLYTOPAL RESOLUTION FOR TRANSVERSAL MONOMIAL IDEALS

RAHIM ZAARE-NAHANDI
UNIVERSITY OF TEHRAN

Abstract. Let $S = k[x_{11}, \cdots, x_{1b_1}, \cdots, x_{n1}, \cdots, x_{nb_n}]$ be a polynomial ring in $m = b_1 + \cdots + b_n$ variables over a field k. For all j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, let P_j be the prime ideal generated by variables $\{x_{j1}, \cdots, x_{jb_j}\}$ and let

$$I_{n,t} = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_t \leq n} P_{j_1} \dots P_{j_t}$$

be the *transversal monomial ideal of degree t on $P_1, \cdots, P_n$*. We explicitly construct a canonical polytopal $\mathbb{Z}^t$-graded minimal free resolution for the ideal $I_{n,t}$ by means of suitable gluing of polytopes.

1. Introduction

The idea to describe a resolution of a monomial ideal by means of combinatorial-geometric chain complexes was initiated by Bayer, Peeva and Sturmfels [2], and was extended by Bayer and Sturmfels [3]. Novik, Postnikov and Sturmfels gave a polytopal complex that supports the minimal free resolution of matroidal ideals [17]. Further extension was made by Jöllembeck and Welker who used discrete Morse theory to construct desired CW complexes [13]. Sinefakoupols showed that the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution [6] of Borel-fixed monomial ideals which are Borel-fixed generated in one degree are cellular supported on a union of convex polytopes [20, Theorem 20]. Mermin and Clark, separately, constructed regular cell complexes which support the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution of a stable monomial ideal [14], [7]. On the other hand, Valesco showed that there exist minimal free monomial resolutions which can not be supported on any CW-complex [21]. Still from a different point of view, Fløystad investigated monomial labelings on cell complexes which give minimal free resolution of the ideal generated by these monomials in the case the quotient ring is Cohen-Macaulay [10]. Dochtermann and Engström gave a cellular resolutions for the ideals of cointerval hypergraphs supported on polyhedral complexes and, they extended their construction to more general hypergraphs [5, Theorems 4.4 and 6.1]. Further on, Engström and Norén constructed cellular resolutions for powers of ideals of a bipartite graph [8, Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 7.2]. Okazaki and Yanagawa showed that the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution of a Cohen-Macaulay stable monomial ideal is supported by a regular CW complex whose underlying space is a closed ball and they improved their result to some variants of Bore-fixed ideals [18, Theorem 3.8]. More recently, Goodarzi proved that the Herzog-Takayama resolution [12] is cellular [9]. This is a resolution for the

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D02, 13F20.
Key words and phrases. Minimal free resolution, cellular resolution, transversal monomial ideal.

class of monomial ideals with regular linear quotients. This class includes matroidal ideals and stable monomial ideals.

In this paper we consider the class of transversal monomial ideals of degree t (see Definition 2.4). A minimal free resolution for monomial ideals in this class was given in [23] and [22]. However, in general, this resolution is not polytopal (see Remark 3.4). We construct a labeled polytopal cell complex which provides a canonical $\mathbb{Z}^t$-graded minimal free resolution for transversal monomial ideals of degree t. Any such monomial ideal is in fact a matroidal ideal (see Remark 2.5). Thus, by [9] its Herzog-Takayama resolution is cellular. Nevertheless, the Herzog-Takayama resolution is obtained by consecutive applications of mapping cone constructions. In contrast, the resolution provided here is based on decomposing any ideal in this class and "gluing" together the polytopal cell complexes associated to each summand to get a polytopal cell complex which gives the expected resolution (see Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.3). This resolution is explicit and is much simpler to compute compared to the Herzog-Takayama resolution (see Example 3.5). Furthermore, unlike most results which prove cellularity of certain known resolutions, the cell-complex constructed here provides the resolution.

The paper is organized is as follows. After the introduction in Section 1, in Section 2 we provide preliminary material and notations. Section 3 is devoted to the main result, the construction of a polytopal cell complex that supports a graded minimal free resolution of a transversal monomial ideal. Then the square-free Veronese ideals of fixed degree, the only Cohen-Macaulay case of this class of ideals, is treated. In this case, the cell complex is a polytopal subdivision of a simplex, in particular, its underlying space is homeomorphic to a closed ball. This last result, using some "depolarization", also follows by a result of Sinefakopoulos [20].

2. Notations and preliminaries

We assume familiarity with basic notions of cell complexes, polytopes and monomial ideals referring to [24], [4], [15] and [11]. In particular, we have freely used several statements and results from [20]. Let $I \subset R = \mathbf{k}[y_1, \cdots, y_n]$ be a monomial ideal in the polynomial ring over a field $\mathbf{k}$ and let $G(I)$ be the unique minimal monomial generating set of I. Let X be a regular cell complex with vertices labeled by members of $G(I)$. Let ϵ_X be an incidence function on X. Any face of X will be labeled by $\mathbf{m}_F$, the least common multiple of the monomials in $G(I)$ on the vertices of F. If $\mathbf{m}_F = y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_n^{a_n}$, then the *degree* $\mathbf{a}_F$ is defined to be the exponent vector $e(\mathbf{m}_F) = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$. Let RF be the free R-module with one generator in degree $\mathbf{a}_F$. The *cellular complex* $\mathbf{F}_X$ is the $\mathbb{Z}^n$-graded R-module $\bigoplus_{\emptyset \neq F \in X} RF$ with differentials

$$\partial(F) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq F' \in X} \epsilon(F, F') \frac{\mathbf{m}_F}{\mathbf{m}_{F'}} F',$$

where $\epsilon(F, F')$ is nonzero only if F' is a face of F of codimension 1 and is $+1$ or -1 such that the resulting sequence is a chain complex (see [3]).

If the complex $\mathbf{F}_X$ is is exact, then $\mathbf{F}_X$ is called a cellular resolution of I. Alternatively, we say that I has a cellular resolution supported on the labeled cell

complex X. If X is a simplicial complex or a polytopal cell complex, then $\mathbf{F}_X$ is called *simplicial* and *polytopal* resolution, respectively. A cellular resolution $\mathbf{F}_X$ is minimal if and only if any two comparable faces $F' \subset F$ of the same degree coincide. For more on cellular resolutions and polytopal complexes we refer to [4], [15] and [24].

The following two lemmas will be essential for our constructions.

Lemma 2.1. *(The gluing lemma)* [20, Lemma 6]. *Let I and J be two monomial ideals in R such that $G(I+J) = G(I) \cup G(J)$. Suppose that*
(i) X and Y are labeled regular cell complexes in some $\mathbb{R}^N$ that supports a minimal free resolution $\mathbf{F}_X$ and $\mathbf{F}_Y$ of I and J, respectively, and
(ii) $X \cap Y$ is a labeled regular cell complex that supports a minimal free resolution $\mathbf{F}_{X\cap Y}$ of $I \cap J$.
Then $X \cup Y$ is a labeled regular cell complex that supports a minimal free resolution of $I + J$.

Remark 2.2. [20, Remark 7]. *For any two monomial ideals I and J, we have*

$$G(I+J) \subseteq G(I) \cup G(J).$$

A case where equality holds is when all elements of $G(I) \cup G(J)$ are of the same degree, or more generally, when $G(I) \cup G(J)$ is a minimal set of generators.

Lemma 2.3. [20, Lemma 8]. *Let $I \subset \mathbf{k}[y_1, \cdots, y_k]$ and $J \subset \mathbf{k}[y_{k+1}, \cdots, y_n]$ be two monomial ideals. Suppose that X and Y are labeled regular cell complexes in some $\mathbb{R}^N$ of dimensions $k-1$ and $n-k-1$, respectively, that support minimal free resolutions $\mathbf{F}_X$ and $\mathbf{F}_Y$ of I and J, respectively. Then the labeled cell complex $X \times Y$ supports a minimal free resolution $\mathbf{F}_{X\times Y}$ of IJ.*

Recall that a simplicial complex $\mathcal{M}$ on $[n] = \{1, \cdots, n\}$ is called a *matroid* if, for any two distinct facets F and G of $\mathcal{M}$ and for any $i \in F$, there exists $j \in G$ such that $(F \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}$ is a facet of $\mathcal{M}$. A matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is said to have *strong exchange property* if, for any two distinct facets F and G of $\mathcal{M}$ and for any $i \in F$, $j \in G \setminus F$, $(F \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}$ is a facet of $\mathcal{M}$. Let $A = \{v_1, \cdots, v_m\}$ be a set of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The set of all linearly independent subsets of A of cardinality $t \leq n$ forms a matroid which is called a *linear matroid*. A matroid is called linear if it has a representation using a vector space over a field. A monomial ideal $I \subset \mathbf{k}[y_1, \cdots, y_n]$ is said to be a *matroidal ideal* if it is the facet ideal of a matroid $\mathcal{M}$ on $[n]$ under some labeling of vertices of $\mathcal{M}$ by the variables $y_1, \cdots, y_n$.

Definition 2.4. *We fix positive integers $1 \leq b_1 \leq \cdots \leq b_n$ and a polynomial ring*

$$S = k[x_{11}, \cdots, x_{1b_1}, \cdots, x_{n1}, \cdots, x_{nb_n}]$$

in $m = b_1 + \cdots + b_n$ variables over a field k. Let $P_j = (x_{j1}, \cdots, x_{jb_j})$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. The ideal

$$I_{n,t} = \sum_{1\leq j_1<\cdots<j_t\leq n} P_{j_1} \dots P_{j_t} = \sum_{1\leq j_1<\cdots<j_t\leq n} P_{j_1} \cap \dots \cap P_{j_t}$$

is called the transversal monomial ideal of degree t on $P_1, \cdots, P_n$.

This class of ideals naturally arises in the study of generic singularities of algebraic varieties [19].

It is helpful to notice that the ideal $I_{n,t}$ may also be realized as the ideal of t-minors of a matrix D where

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1b_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & x_{21} & \cdots & x_{2b_2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{nb_n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 2.5. *Let $\{v_1, \cdots, v_n\}$ be a vector space basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For each i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, let λ_{ij}, $j = 1, \cdots, b_i$, be distinct nonzero real numbers. Let $A = \{\lambda_{ij} v_i : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq b_i\}$. In other words, A is a set of vectors linearly independent up to proportionality. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the linear matroid of all linearly independent subsets of A of cardinality $t \leq n$. Then $I_{n,t}$ is the facet ideal of the linear matroid $\mathcal{M}$, when the vertex corresponding to $\lambda_{ij} v_i$ is labeled by x_{ij}. In particular, $I_{n,t}$ is a matroidal ideal. Therefore, $I_{n,t}$ has linear quotients* [11, Theorem 12.6.2]*, and a linear resolution* [1] *or* [11, Lemma 8.2.1]*. On the other hand, the only case $I_{n,t}$ is Cohen-Macaualay is the case of the square-free Veronese ideal of degree t, i.e., the case $b_1 = \cdots = b_n = 1$, $n = m$* [11, Theorem 12.6.7]*. In this case the corresponding matroid $\mathcal{M}$ has the strong exchange property.*

3. A cellular graded resolution for transversal monomial ideals

In this section we construct a polytopal cell complex that supports a graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}$.

We will need the construction for certain special cases.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\Delta(P_i)$ be the $(b_i - 1)$-simplex with vertices labeled by variables generating P_i. Then the following statements hold:*
(a) The labeled cartesian product of simplexes $\Gamma_{n,n} = \Delta(P_1) \times \cdots \times \Delta(P_t)$ supports a $\mathbb{Z}^n$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,n} = P_1.\cdots.P_n$.
(b) $I_{n,n-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} P_1.\cdots.P_{i-1}.(P_i + P_{i+1}).P_{i+2}.\cdots.P_n$, and the labeled cell complex

$$\Gamma_{n,n-1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Delta(P_1) \times \cdots \times \Delta(P_{i-1}) \times \Delta(P_i + P_{i+1}) \times \Delta(P_{i+2}) \times \cdots \times \Delta(P_n)$$

supports a $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,n-1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n-1} \subset \Gamma_{n,n}$.

Proof. (a) The Koszul complex on the sequence $\{x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{ib_i}\}$ is a minimal free resolution of P_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $\Delta(P_i)$ supports the minimal free resolution of P_i. Hence by Lemma 2.3 the cartesian product $\Delta(P_1) \times \cdots \Delta(P_n)$, as a labeled polytopal cell complex, supports a $\mathbb{Z}^n$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,n}$.

(b) We use induction on n for both claims. A generator of $I_{n,n-1}$ is either a monomial with a variable in P_n or with a variable in $P_{n-1} + P_n$. Thus we have

$$I_{n,n-1} = I_{n-1,n-2}.P_n + I_{n-2,n-2}.(P_{n-1} + P_n).$$

Replacing $I_{n-1,n-2}$ by induction hypothesis and $I_{n-2,n-2}$ by (a) the equality for $I_{n,n-1}$ follows.
Now by induction hypothesis and Lemma 2.3, $\Gamma_{n-1,n-2} \times \Delta(P_n)$ and $\Gamma_{n-2,n-2} \times \Delta(P_{n-1} + P_n)$ provide labeled cell complexes which support $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$-graded minimal free resolutions of $I_{n-1,n-2}.P_n$ and $I_{n-2,n-2}.(P_{n-1} + P_n)$, respectively. The conditions of the gluing lema are satisfied for these two ideals and the cell complexes. In fact, since the generators of P_i's form a partition of the set of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&[I_{n-1,n-2}.P_n] \cap [I_{n-2,n-2}.(P_{n-1} + P_n)]\\ &= [I_{n-1,n-2} \cap P_n] \cap [I_{n-2,n-2} \cap (P_{n-1} + P_n)]\\ &= I_{n-2,n-2}.P_n.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, replacing $\Gamma_{n-1,n-2}$ and $\Gamma_{n-2,n-2}$ by induction hypothesis and (a), we get

$$[\Gamma_{n-1,n-2} \times \Delta(P_n)] \cap [\Gamma_{n-2,n-2} \times \Delta(P_{n-1} + P_n)] = \Gamma_{n-2,n-2} \times \Delta(P_n),$$

while the last equality follows by the inclusion $\Gamma_{n-2,n-2} \subset \Gamma_{n-1,n-2}$ which is a consequence of the expressions of them using induction hypothesis. Therefore,

$$[\Gamma_{n-1,n-2} \times \Delta(P_n)] \cup [\Gamma_{n-2,n-2} \times \Delta(P_{n-1} + P_n)] = \Gamma_{n,n-1}$$

is a $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,n-1}$.
Finally, the inclusion $\Gamma_{n,n-1} \subset \Gamma_{n,n}$ follows by the expression of the cell complexes in (b).

□

To prove the main result, we will further need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For integers $1 \leq q \leq p \leq n$ and $1 \leq r \leq n$, let*

$$I_{p,q} = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_q \leq p} P_{j_1} \ldots . P_{j_q},$$

and

$$Q_r = \sum_{j=r}^{n} P_j.$$

Then;
(a) For all t, $2 \leq t \leq n$, the following holds

$$I_{n,t} = \sum_{i=t-1}^{n-1} I_{i,t-1}.Q_{i+1}.$$

(b) For all s, $t \leq s \leq n$, let

$$I_{n,t}(s) = \sum_{i=t-1}^{s-1} I_{i,t-1}.Q_{i+1}.$$

Then for all s, $t \leq s \leq n-1$, we have

$$I_{n,t}(s) \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] = I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}.$$

(By (a), $I_{n,t}(s)$ is the transversal monomial ideal of degree t on $P_1, \cdots, P_{s-1}$, and $Q_s = P_s + \cdots + P_n$.)

Proof. For $1 \leq r \leq s \leq n$, let

$$Q_r(s) = \sum_{j=r}^{s} P_j,$$

so that in particular, $Q_r(n) = Q_r$.
To prove (a) we use induction on n. For $n = t$ the equality is clear. Assuming the quality for integers less than n, the inclusion $\supseteq$ is obvious for n because each term in the sum is contained in $I_{n,t}$. For the other inclusion, observe that

$$I_{n,t} = I_{n-1,t} + I_{n-1,t-1}.Q_n.$$

By induction hypothesis, we have

$$I_{n-1,t} = \sum_{i=t-1}^{n-2} I_{i,t-1}.Q_{i+1}(n-1).$$

Replacing this in the previous equality the inclusion $\subseteq$ also follows by term by term inclusion.
(b). By (a) we get

$$I_{n,t}(s) = \sum_{i=t-1}^{s-1} I_{i,t-1}.Q_{i+1}(s) + (\sum_{i=t-1}^{s-1} I_{i,t-1}).Q_{s+1} = I_{s,t} + I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}.$$

Since *the modular law* holds for monomial ideals, we have

$$I_{n,t}(s) \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] = [I_{s,t} + I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}]$$

$$= I_{s,t} \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] + [I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}].$$

Since $I_{s-1,t-1} \subseteq I_{s,t-1}$, the resulting expression is equal to

$$I_{s,t} \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] + [I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}].$$

But $I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1} = I_{s,t-1} \cap Q_{s+1}$ and $I_{s,t} \cap Q_{s+1} = I_{s,t}.Q_{s+1}$ because the set of variables involved in the generators of $I_{s,t-1}$ or $I_{s,t}$ is disjoint from the the set of variable generators of Q_{s+1}. Thus by the fact that $I_{s,t} \subseteq I_{s,t-1}$ we get

$$I_{s,t} \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] = I_{s,t} \cap I_{s,t-1} \cap Q_{s+1} = I_{s,t} \cap Q_{s+1} = I_{s,t}.Q_{s+1}.$$

Therefore, using the inclusion $I_{s,t} \subseteq I_{s-1,t-1}$, we have

$$I_{n,t}(s) \cap [I_{s,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] = [I_{s,t}.Q_{s+1}] + [I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1}] = I_{s-1,t-1}.Q_{s+1},$$

as required. □

We may now give the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3.3. *There exists a labeled regular polytopal cell complex $\Gamma_{n,t} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m-t}$ that supports a $\mathbb{Z}^t$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}$. Explicitly,*

$$\Gamma_{n,t} = \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{n-1} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})],$$

where by $\Delta(Q_{i+1})$ we mean the simplex with vertices on the variables generating $Q_{i+1} = \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} P_j$. Moreover, $\Gamma_{s,t}$ is connected, and as labeled polytopes, $\Gamma_{s,t} \subset \Gamma_{s+1,t}$ for all s, $t \leq s \leq n-1$.

Proof. Observe that the cell complex $\Gamma_{n,t}$ defined recursively as above, can also be labeled recursively. Thus we first show the inclusion $\Gamma_{k,t} \subset \Gamma_{k+1,t}$ as labeled cell complexes, for all k, $t \leq k \leq n-1$. Using the notation of the previous lemma we have

$$\Gamma_{k,t} = \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{k-1} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1}(k))] \subset \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{k} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1}(k+1))] = \Gamma_{k+1,t}.$$

For all s, $t \leq s \leq n$, similar to $I_{n,t}(s)$ defined in the previous lemma, let

$$\Gamma_{n,t}(s) = \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{s-1} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})],$$

so that $\Gamma_{n,t}(n) = \Gamma_{n,t}$. Thus we have

$$\Gamma_{n,t}(s) = \Gamma_{n,t}(s-1) \cup [\Gamma_{s-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_s)].$$

Using this identity we prove by induction on s, $t \leq s \leq n$, that $\Gamma_{n,t}(s)$ supports a $\mathbb{Z}^t$-graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}(s)$, implying the claim for $s = n$. For $s = t$, $\Gamma_{n,t}(t) = \Gamma_{t-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_s)$ which support a graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}(t) = I_{t-1,t-1}.Q_s$ by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2. Assume that $\Gamma_{n,t}(s)$ supports a graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}(s)$ for all s, n, t with $t \leq s < s_0 \leq n$. We claim

$$\Gamma_{n,t}(s_0) = \Gamma_{n,t}(s_0 - 1) \cup [\Gamma_{s_0-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0})]$$

supports a graded minimal free resolution of

$$I_{n,t}(s_0) = I_{n,t}(s_0 - 1) + [I_{s_0-1,t-1}.Q_{s_0}].$$

We apply the gluing lemma. By induction hypothesis each summand of $\Gamma_{n,t}(s_0)$ supports a graded minimal free resolution of the corresponding summand in $I_{n,t}(s_0)$. By the previous lemma,

$$I_{n,t}(s_0 - 1) \cap [I_{s_0-1,t-1}.Q_{s_0}] = I_{s_0-2,t-1}.Q_{s_0}.$$

We also have

$$\Gamma_{n,t}(s_0-1) \cap [\Gamma_{s_0-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0})] = [\bigcup_{i=t-1}^{s_0-2} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})] \cap [\Gamma_{s_0-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0})]$$

$$= \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{s_0-2} [(\Gamma_{i,t-1} \cap \Gamma_{s_0-1,t-1}) \times (\Delta(Q_{i+1}) \cap \Delta(Q_{i+1})] = \Gamma_{s_0-2,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0}),$$

where the last equality is valid by Proposition 3.1. But $\Gamma_{s_0-2,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0})$ supports a graded minimal free resolution of $I_{s_0-2,t-1}.Q_{s_0}$, which is what we need for the gluing lemma. Therefore, $\Gamma_{n,t}(s_0)$ supports a graded minimal free resolution of $I_{n,t}(s_0)$ as required. The regularity of $\Gamma_{n,t}$ is clear because every polytopal cell complex is regular [24]. The connectedness of $\Gamma_{n,t}$ follows from the equality

$$\Gamma_{n,t}(s_0 - 1) \cap [\Gamma_{s_0-1,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0})] = \Gamma_{s_0-2,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{s_0}).$$

□

Remark 3.4. *The minimal free resolution provided in* [23, Theorem 3.1] *and* [22, Theorem 2.1] *for a transversal monomial ideal is not polytopal for* $2 \leq t \leq n-3$. *As an example, consider* $I_{5,2}$ *(*$m = n = 5$*). Following the construction there, the corresponding cell complex is the same as the Morse complex which supports a*

minimal free resolution of $(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)^2 \subset \mathbf{k}[y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4]$ *illustrated in* [20, Fig. 3] *which is not polytopal. In fact, the two "faces"* $\{x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_3x_5, x_2x_3\}$ *and* $\{x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_3x_4, x_2x_3\}$ *have two edges in common but their union is not a face of either of them.*

Example 3.5. *Consider* $I_{4,3}$ *with* $b_1 = b_2 = 2$, $b_3 = b_4 = 1$. *Then*

$\Gamma_{4,3} = [\Delta(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{21}, x_{22}) \times \Delta(x_{31}) \times \Delta(x_{41})] \cup [\Delta(x_{11}, x_{12}) \times \Delta(, x_{21}, x_{22}, x_{31}) \times \Delta(x_{41})] \cup [\Delta(x_{11}, x_{12}) \times \Delta(, x_{21}, x_{22}) \times \Delta(x_{31}, x_{41})]$.

This is illustrated in Figure 1.



Figure 1

The minimal free resolution of $I_{4,3}$ *(ignoring the fine grading) is immediate from Figure 1 as*

$$0 \longrightarrow S^3(-5) \longrightarrow S^{22}(-4) \longrightarrow S^{12}(-3) \longrightarrow I_{4,3} \longrightarrow 0.$$

The Herzog-Takayama resolution for $I_{4,3}$ *requires 11 consecutive mapping cone constructions.*
This example reveals that, in general, the cell complex $\Gamma_{n,t}$ *is not convex, and its underlying topological space is not homeomorphic to a closed ball.*

For $m = n$, i.e., $b_1 = \cdots = b_n = 1$, $I_{n,t}$ is the *square-free Veronese ideal of degree* t on the variables. To distinguish this case, we use the notation x_i, $I_{m,t}$ and $\Gamma_{m,t}$ instead of x_{i1}, $I_{n,t}$ and $\Gamma_{n,t}$, respectively. In this case, $\Gamma_{m,t}$ enjoys the following further features.

Proposition 3.6. *The polytopal cell complex $\Gamma_{m,t}$ which supports the $\mathbb{Z}^t$-graded minimal free resolution of the square-free Veronese ideal of degree t on $x_1, \cdots, x_m$, is a polytopal subdivision of the $(m-t)$-simplex*

$$\Delta(x_1 \cdots x_t, x_2 \cdots x_{t+1}, \cdots, x_{n-t+1} \cdots x_m).$$

In particular, $\Gamma_{m,t}$ is shellable and its underlying topological space is homeomorphic to a closed ball.

Proof. The proof is by induction on t. For $t = 1$, it is trivial; $\Gamma_{m,1} = \Delta(x_1, \cdots, x_m)$. We also need to check the claim for $t = 2$. Adopting the notation of Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\Gamma_{m,2} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} [\Gamma_{i,1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} [\Delta(x_1, \cdots, x_i) \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})].$$

Thus, using the notation $||$ for the underlying topological spaces of the polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^{m-t}$, we have

$$|\Gamma_{m,2}| = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} |\Delta(x_1, \cdots, x_i)| \times |\Delta(Q_{i+1})| = |\Delta(x_1x_2, x_2x_3, \cdots, x_{m-1}x_m)|,$$

where the last equality is a natural partition of the $(m-2)$-simplex on

$$\{x_1x_2, x_2x_3, \cdots, x_{m-1}x_m\}$$

into the union of polytopes while each polytope is the product of an $(i-1)$-simplex on $\{x_1, \cdots, x_i\}$ with an $(m-i-1)$-simplex on $\{x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_m\}$, $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$. Thus, $\Gamma_{m,2}$ is a regular subdivision of the $(m-2)$-simplex $\Delta(x_1x_2, x_2x_3, \cdots, x_{m-1}x_m)$. For the induction step, by the previous theorem

$$\Gamma_{m,t} = \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{m-1} [\Gamma_{i,t-1} \times \Delta(Q_{i+1})].$$

By induction hypothesis

$$|\Gamma_{m,t}| = \bigcup_{i=t-1}^{m-1} [|\Delta(y_{t-1}, \cdots, y_i)| \times |\Delta(Q_{i+1})|],$$

where, $y_i = x_{i-t+2} \cdots x_i$, $i = t-1, \cdots, m-1$. Thus by the case $t = 2$,

$$|\Gamma_{m,t}| = |\Delta(y_{t-1}x_t, y_tx_{t+1}, \cdots, y_{m-1}x_m)| = |\Delta(x_1 \cdots x_t, x_2 \cdots x_{t+1}, \cdots, x_{m-t+1} \cdots x_m)|$$

as required.
Shellability of $\Gamma_{n,t}$ follows from a general result that any regular subdivision of a simplex is shellable [24, page 243]. The underlying topological space of $\Gamma_{n,t}$ is a closed ball since it is a regular subdivision of a simplex. □

Remark 3.7. *Proposition 3.6 also follows by a result of Sinefakopoulos* [20, Theorem 12]. *In fact, let $s = n - t + 1$and let $J = (y_1, \cdots, y_s)^t \subset \mathbf{k}[y_1, \cdots, y_s]$. The depolarization given by Nagel and Reiner (see Section 3* [16]*)*

$$x_{i_1}x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_t} \mapsto y_{i_1}y_{i_2-1} \cdots y_{i_t-t+1}, \quad i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_t$$

is a bijection on the minimal monomial generators of $I_{n,t}$ and J. The inverse map is

$$y_1^{j_1}y_2^{j_2} \cdots y_s^{j_s} \mapsto x_1x_2 \cdots x_{j_1}x_{j_1+2}x_{j_1+3} \cdots x_{j_1+j_2+1} \cdots x_{j_1+\cdots+j_{s-1}+s} \cdots x_{j_1+\cdots+j_s+s-1},$$

where $j_1 + \cdots + j_s = t$. *The change of labeling* $x_{i_1}x_{i_2}\cdots x_{i_t}$ *to* $y_{i_1}y_{i_2-1}\cdots y_{i_t-t+1}$ *converts the polytopal cell complex* $\Gamma_{n,t}$ *into the polytopal cell complex* $P_t(y_1, \cdots, y_s)$ *constructed by Sinefakopoulos which supports the resolution of* J *(see the proof of* [20, Theorem 12] *for notations). Observe that under this change of labeling, the subdivision structures of* $\Gamma_{n,t}$ *on the simplex* $\Delta(x_1\cdots x_t, \cdots, x_{n-t+1}\cdots x_n)$ *converts to that of* $P_t(y_1, \cdots, y_s)$ *on* $\Delta(y_1^t, \cdots, y_s^t)$.

Remark 3.8. *For* $m > n$ *the ideal* $I_{n,t}$ *is not Borel-fixed (i.e., strongly stable for characteristic zero) under certain depolarization similar to Remark 3.7. For example, consider* $I_{2,2}$ *with* $b_1 = b_2 = 2$. *Then it follows that* $I_{2,2}$ *is not strongly stable under the expected depolarization.*

Question 3.9. Sinefakopoulos [20] has used the gluing procedure to build up a polytopal cell complex which gives a minimal free resolution for the Borel-fixed monomial ideals which are Borel-fixed generated in one degree. In this paper similar procedure has been employed for the transversal monomial ideals. One expects other monomial ideals for which the gluing construction provides a minimal free resolution. In particular, we may ask whether one could construct a similar cell complex to the Herzog-Takayama resolution, and if possible, when is the resulting cell complex homeomorphic to a closed ball?

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Gunnar Fløystad for his comments on the first attempt towards this paper, for bringing attention to [20] and [16], and for suggesting to work on the cellularity of transversal monomial ideals. He thanks Afshin Goodarzi for his useful comments on the final version of the paper. This work has been partially supported by research grant no. 4/1/6103011 of University of Tehran.

References

1. A. Björner, *Homology and shellability of matroids and geometric lattices*, in *Matroid Applications* (ed. by N. White), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).
2. D. Bayer, I. Peeva and B. Sturmfels, *Monomial resolutions, Math. Res. Lett.* **5** (1998) 31–46.
3. D. Bayer and B. Sturmfels, *Cellular resolutions of monomial modules*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **502** (1998) 123–140.
4. W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay Rings,* Cambridge University Press, 1998.
5. A. Dochtermann and A. Engström, *Cellular resolutions of cointerval ideals*, Math. Z. **270 (1-2)** (2012) 145–163.
6. S. Eliahou and M. Kervaire, *Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals*, J. Algebra **129** (1990) 1–25.
7. T. Clark, *A minimal poset resolution of stable ideals* In: Progress in Commutative Algebra I: Combinatorics and Homology, pp. 143-166, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
8. A. Engström and P. Norén, *Cellular resolutions of powers of monomial ideals*, arXiv:1212.2146v.1 10 Dec 2012.
9. A. Goodarzi, *Cellular structure for the Herzog-Takayam resolution*, J. Algebr. Comb. **41** (2015) 21–28.
10. G. Flöystad, *Cellular resolutions of Cohen-Macaulay monomial ideals*, J. Commut. Algebra **1 (1)** (2009), 57–89.
11. J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*, Grad. Texts Math. **260**, Springer, New York, 2011.
12. J. Herzog and Y. Takayama, *Resolutions by mapping cones*, The Roos Festschrift, Vol. 2, Homology, Hmotopt Appl. 4 (2, part 2) (2002) 277–294.
13. M Jöllenbeck and V. Welker, *Minimal resolutions via algebraic dicrete Morse thory*, Mm. Aer. Math. Soc. **197** (2009).

14. J. Mermin, *The Eliahou-Kervaire resolution is cellular*, J. Commut. Algebra **2 (1)** (2010) 55–78.
15. E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra*, Grad. Texts Math. **227**, Springer, New York, 2005.
16. U. Nagel and V. Reiner, *Betti numbers of monomial ideals and shifted skew shapes*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **16 (2)** (2009), #R3.
17. I. Novik, A. Postnikov, and B. Sturmfels, *Syzygies of oriented matroids*, Duke Math. J. **111 (2)** (2002) 287–317.
18. R. Okazaki, and K. Yanagawa, *On CW complexes supporting the Eliahou-Kervaire type resolutions of Borel fixed ideals*, Collect. Math. **66 (1)** (2015) 125–147.
19. P. Salmon and R. Zaare-Nahandi, *Ideals of minors defining generic singularities and their Gröbner bases*, Commun. Algebra **33 (8)** (2005) 2725–2747.
20. A. Sinefakopoulos, *On Borel fixed ideals generated in one degree*, J. Algebra **319 (7)** (2008) 2739–2760.
21. M. Valesco, *Minimal free resolutions that are not supported by a CW-complex*, J. Algebra 319 (2008) 102–114.
22. R. Zaare-Nahandi, *Betti numbers of transversal monomial ideals*, Algebra Colloq. **18** (Spec 1) (2011) 925–936.
23. Rahim Zaare-Nahandi and Rashid Zaare-Nahandi, *The minimal free resolution of a class of square-free monomial ideals*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **189** (2004) 263-278.
24. G. Ziegler, *Lectures on Polytopes*, Grad. Texts in Math., vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.